

## **REMARKS**

In the Office Action, claims 2 and 3 were rejected 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being unpatentable over Bäßler (U.S. Pat. No. 5,075,195).

A product in accordance with the present invention has the following features:

(1) a substrate of an object to be marked is made of a PTFE and the PTFE contains a filler for reinforcement;

(2) the PTFE is formed in a compressive manner and fibers of the PTFE and filler are interlaced;

(3) a laser beam is irradiated onto a marking position on the object to be marked to form a surface of the PTFE including a fluffed portion at the marking position of the irradiated object to be marked (the PTFE is a laser beam sensitive material - see Figure 1);

(4) the fluffed portion includes the PTFE released from interlacement of the fibers of the PTFE and filler by means of energy of the laser beam; and

(5) the fluffed portion on the surface of the PTFE exhibits a white-based color contrast different from a color contrast of a non-irradiated surface of the PTFE.

The cited Bäßler patent neither discloses nor suggests the above features (1) to (5).

Although the method of the cited reference discloses, at column 2, lines 28-29, that the plastics object includes a PTFE (polyterafluoroethylene), the plastics object contains a molybdenum disulfide as a radiation-sensitive additive (see column 2, lines 28-29). When the molybdenum disulfide is subject to irradiation of a laser beam, it changes a light reflectance to form a marking on the object.

The best wavelength to be selected from the irradiation is that at which the radiation-sensitive  $\text{MoS}_2$  and that at which the plastic material (for example, PTFE) to be marked absorbs little (see column 6, lines 26-30). Accordingly, the cited reference neither discloses nor suggests that the irradiation of the laser beam can fluff the surface of PTFE. The cited reference suggests that the plastic material (for example, PTFE) should not be subject to the irradiation of the laser beam. In other words, the PTFE in the Bähler patent does not serve as a laser beam sensitive material.

Based on the foregoing amendments and remarks, it is respectfully submitted that the claims in the present application, as they now stand, patentably distinguish over the references cited and applied by the Examiner and are, therefore, in condition for allowance. A Notice of Allowance is in order, and such favorable action and reconsideration are respectfully requested.

However, if after reviewing the above amendments and remarks, the Examiner has any questions or comments, he is cordially invited to contact the undersigned attorneys.

Respectfully submitted,

JACOBSON HOLMAN PLLC

By: *Jonathan I. Holman Reg. No. 29,851*  
John C. Holman  
Reg. No. 22,769

400 Seventh Street, N.W.  
Washington, D.C. 20004-2201  
(202) 638-6666  
Date: June 25, 2008  
JCH/JLS/crj